## Case 1:12-cr-00863-LAP Document 454 Filed 08/10/15 Page 1 of 20

F4dQhenS UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 1 SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK -----x 2 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA 3 12 CR 863 (LAP) V. 4 Sentence KEVIN HENDERSON 5 Defendant -----x 6 7 New York, N.Y. April 13, 2015 8 10:35 a.m. 9 Before: 10 HON. LORETTA A. PRESKA 11 District Judge 12 APPEARANCES 13 PREET BHARARA 14 United States Attorney for the Southern District of New York 15 DANIEL B. TEHRANI Assistant United States Attorney 16 JOSHUA L. DRATEL PC 17 Attorneys for Defendant Henderson JOSHUA L. DRATEL WHITNEY SCHLIMBACH 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25

1	(In open court)
2	THE COURT: United States against Kevin Henderson.
3	Is the government ready?
4	MR. TEHRANI: Yes. Good morning, your Honor. Daniel
5	Tehrani for the government. Your Honor, if I may, I'd like to
6	apologize to the Court. Mr. Henderson's sentence was scheduled
7	for last week.
8	THE COURT: Thank you very much. I apologize for my
9	tardiness. Is defense ready?
10	MR. DRATEL: Yes Joshua Dratel for Mr. Henderson.
11	Also with me is Ms. Schlimbach from my office.
12	THE COURT: Mr. Dratel, have you and your client had
13	time to review the presentence report?
14	MR. DRATEL: Yes, we have.
15	THE COURT: Is there any reason it should not be made
16	part of the record?
17	MR. DRATEL: No, your Honor.
18	THE COURT: Are there any objections to the
19	presentence report?
20	MR. DRATEL: No, your Honor. All of the objections or
21	corrections that we submitted to the draft report have been
22	incorporated in one form or another.
23	THE COURT: Thank you.
24	With respect to the offense level computation: I
25	accept the findings of the presentence report set forth at

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

paragraphs 58 through 68 which conclude that a total offense level of 29 is appropriate.

With respect to the defendant's criminal history, I accept the findings of the presentence report set forth at paragraphs 69 through 94 which conclude that a Criminal History category of I is appropriate.

Mr. Dratel, I have your sentencing submission dated April 1. I have the government's sentencing memorandum dated -- I'm sorry -- it's a Criminal History Category VI. think I misspoke.

We agree to that, don't we, counsel?

MR. TEHRANI: Yes, your Honor.

MR. DRATEL: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: The government's sentencing memorandum is dated April 8.

Are there any additional written materials I should be looking at?

MR. TEHRANI: Nothing from the government, your Honor.

MR. DRATEL: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. Dratel, would you like to speak on behalf of Mr. Henderson?

MR. DRATEL: I would, your Honor. Thank you.

First, I just wanted to note that there were family and friends who were able to be here Thursday. Unfortunately, I don't think -- I know there was one woman Helene Jones, who

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

wrote a letter and who actually took a bus overnight Thursday night to be here. She was not able to come back today. I just wanted the Court to be aware that at least two other people were here on Thursday; and if they are absent from the courtroom, the Court should not view this as any lack of interest in the sentence and the affection they have for Mr. Henderson.

THE COURT: Yes, sir.

MR. DRATEL: Obviously, as a matter of guidelines, the career offender quidelines apply. I think based not only on what the Second Ciruit has said many times but what the Court has done in this case, we look beyond that in terms of other defendants in this case. I think for Mr. Henderson there are compelling factors why a sentence in what would otherwise be his guideline range would be appropriate, reasonable and in this case just.

I am not going to go through the entirety of what is in my letter. Obviously, it was designed to be a comprehensive submission.

THE COURT: It certainly was.

MR. DRATEL: Thank you, your Honor.

The point being I want to focus on a couple of things that I think merit mention. One is that with respect to Mr. Henderson's background and his upbringing, from my perspective as a personal perspective, it's hard for me to

fathom what it's like growing up in that environment. I come from a family where my parents loved me. My siblings loved me. They encouraged me. I really don't know how people come back from the kind of upbringing that Mr. Henderson has had on a repeated basis.

It's not an excuse, but I think it is contextual. I think also in the context of his behavior and his conduct in the past two years -- well, the two years I've known him, 18 months that I've known him, but almost three years now that he's been in custody, including his state time, he has made significant progress towards where he needs to be in the world as a human being, as a father, and as a member of society.

I think he is a salvageable person. I think what he had done inside MDC says that as well in terms of not only what he has done for himself but with respect to others, with respect to the GED program. The only reason I put in that footnote about my other client, it's so hard that once the other client left MDC, he was only there for a short period of time, they just dropped it. It's so difficult in these facilities to remain any level of rehabilitation with progress. So, I think that what he did is important in that regard.

I think that the time that Mr. Henderson has already done which starts from June 2012, which is nearly three years now, is not going to be credited towards his federal sentence. If the Court does impose a concurrent sentence, it will only be

the last two months. His sentence will expire in June of this year, his state sentence.

So I would ask the Court to factor that into what ultimate sentence the Court imposes here because, in essence, he could serve — if the Court that a total amount of incarceration is appropriate, it will obviously not run concurrent with these nearly 34 months that he has already been in on his state case.

In that context, also, with respect to the *Mishoe* case in the Second Ciruit in terms of what kind of commitments -- and I'm talking about jail commitments -- that people have had before a career offender sentence is imposed. This the longest one for Mr. Henderson. Obviously, it will be longer if the Court imposes sentence. I think that that also compels a sentence within that 41-to-51 range simply because by the end of the day that will be a substantial term of imprisonment.

He has already made significant adjustments and progress, as I have noted and wrote in the letter. I think projecting into the future, there is not a need for an extended sentence beyond that period of time looking at the fact that he will not get credit having already done his time.

THE COURT: How do we know that, Mr. Dratel?

Mr. Henderson earned his Criminal History VI fair and square both by accumulating twice as many points as is required and also by the nature of his prior convictions.

MR. DRATEL: Yes.

THE COURT: So how do we know?

MR. DRATEL: Your Honor, I agree in the sense that we don't know. We don't know, but I would say that there are couple of factors that the Court can look to to get confidence at the level necessary to impose a sentence within that guideline range.

One is the progress he has made while he's been in custody, which, again, is the longest period of time, we are looking again at the fact that he's going to do more and he is going to continue his rehabilitation. This is someone who had already been in 16 months by the time I met him. I would say he never had an affect that did not recognize where he was, why he was there, and what he needed to do.

When I said to him initially, "You know, your record"

-- before I could even say what it meant, he said to me, "Is

disgusting." That's what he said to me. It's understood, your

Honor. We didn't make an argument that it overstates his

criminal history. That would be inappropriate under the

circumstances.

THE COURT: Candor becomes you, Mr. Dratel.

MR. DRATEL: Also, if you look at what he went through while in custody, it's not in our letter, but it's relevant in this context, which is, while he was in custody at MDC and his fiancée was suffering from kidney failure, he was trying to

| Fadghens

arrange through BOP regulations, which is a chore in itself, to try and see if he could be a match to donate a kidney. Then she passed away. His daughter is out there, and he hasn't even had a chance to see his daughter since then. I don't think it's matter of relationships; it's just a matter of the magnitude of the tragedy for her family.

THE COURT: Am I correct that I read that the daughter's maternal grandmother is looking after her?

MR. DRATEL: Yes.

So that has had a significant impact on him as well, just in terms of his daughter and his desire to be a parent essentially, if not fundamentally, in the context of what lies ahead for him in his future.

Another is also this -- and it's remarkable, but it's true that when we sat down, when he sat down with the probation officer, that was the first time he ever revealed what he has been living with for 25 years, 30 years. I think that that is an important aspect of recovery of the process of getting where he needs to be as a human being to exist in a way that gives a Court that confidence that the Court can err on the side -- not err necessarily -- but decide on the side of something less harsh rather than something more harsh.

There is also a lack of violence. There is also the level at which he operated. He is a person with intelligence, and one could say that cuts against him because why was he

doing what he was doing but at the same time he can be productive. He can be a good parent.

He has been an extraordinarily patient, understanding and resigned client. I mean resigned in the sense that he knows why he's here. He is remorseful and his letter is his letter. It's not my letter.

THE COURT: Let me go back just one second, please.

MR. DRATEL: Sure.

THE COURT: You said non-violent. I do note at paragraph 72 the menacing conviction where it says that:

"Mr. Henderson and an accomplice pointed and discharged a 25 caliber handgun."Now, granted he was apparently 17-years-old at the time, but we do have that fact here.

MR. DRATEL: Yes, your Honor. He was not in possession of the weapon. It goes back a long time, so I don't have a documented version of the facts of that, but it was not my understanding directed at anyone in particular and it was the kind of situation that was obviously regrettable. Again, looking at the age, and the fact that he was not the person who was in possession of the weapon or who fired the weapon I think is a factor.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. DRATEL: A couple of other things: One is that general deterrence I know is a factor, but I know that there are a range of sentences in this case. There are a lot of

defendants to be sentenced. I don't think general deterrence should play a significant role in the context of the sentence for Mr. Henderson. Also, general deterrence as a concept is one that is — it's unverifiable. It is also I think, to a certain extent, not fair to Mr. Henderson getting time for something that someone else did independently.

So I would ask the Court not to increase his sentence based on that particular aspect, even the full range of what's involved in this case, and I mean through the entirety of this case, because I think all sentences provide general deterrence and a think a sentence even within the guideline range is a significant sentence and a substantial sentence, given the time he has served and will not get credit for.

I want think I want to talk about, Judge, is with respect to the government's letter comparing to Ronald Fell. We are not asking for a Ronald Fell's sentence.

I don't know quite the particulars of Mr. Fell's sentencing. I have read the minutes. I know that his Criminal History Category while VI, he does not get points for fewer, probably about half as many, we are asking for something that is commensurate with Mr. Henderson's situation. While there are distinctions with respect to Mr. Bell, I don't think those distinctions are of the magnitude that would require a sentence or justify a sentence either at the Criminal History Guidelines or even something not within the range of what we're talking.

I think that even giving Mr. Bell a sentence, something like 41 to 51, accounting for the fact that he has already basically served three years that won't be credited is comparable to Mr. Bell in a way that would not create a disparity at all, but one which is consistent with the Court's sentencing structure in this case.

THE COURT: So are several of the other individuals who are in Criminal History Category VI, as you know, were also street-level dealers involved in between three and 11 sales and received 120 months.

MR. DRATEL: Yes, your Honor. What I would say to that, I don't know their personal circumstances. I don't know -- certainly, I don't know that any of them had three years in on a state sentence for basically the same conspiracy, for part of the same conspiracy essentially, where it's not going to be credited. I don't know who they are. I have not spent 18, 19 months with them in a way that gives me confidence that Mr. Henderson, again, is a salvageable person.

I hate these cases. There is no solution that is perfect. There is no solution that anybody can be certain about. But I don't think the solution is an extended jail term. I don't see that as a solution, particularly for Mr. Henderson.

And something significantly less than ten years is I think what is appropriate in case, your Honor, and is still a

substantial term that he will have sufficient time to continue his rehabilitation, to continue to evolve in terms of turning his remorse and his understanding of where he is into the kind of commitment that once he's release will be the kind that we can rely on. I think he is getting there. I think he has that capacity. I think given the nature of what's going on in this country with respect to incarceration and sentences and the attorney general himself, I think that is the appropriate thing to do.

THE COURT: Thank you.

2.2

MR. DRATEL: Thank you, your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you.

Mr. Henderson, would you like to speak on your own behalf?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: Would you do it now, please?

THE DEFENDANT: I just want to apologize to the court and to the community that I helped destroy, and I've change my life just to be a better person. Somebody out there that I know loves me and I really want to be there for him. That's all I got. Thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you, sir.

Does the government wish to be heard?

MR. TEHRANI: Unless the Court has any particular questions, the government is prepared to rest on its

submission. I would note that I do believe that a concurrent sentence would be appropriate in this case given the nature of the state sentence that Mr. Henderson is currently serving.

As Mr. Dratel noted, there is no way for the BOP to retroactively count the time that he has already served to a federal sentence or the extent your Honor were inclined to agree that a concurrent sentence would be appropriate, the way to do it would be under 5K1.3, which would be to announce the total sentence that your Honor believes is appropriate and then subtract out how much time he has served and announce a sentence going forward from today of: X to Y months.

THE COURT: Yes, sir. One other question, please.

What is the maximum period of supervised release that may be imposed.

MR. TEHRANI: Your Honor, it's life.

THE COURT: Thank you.

That's close enough.

Anything else, Mr. Dratel?

MR. DRATEL: No, your Honor. Thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you.

Counsel, as you have heard, I have calculated the guidelines and certainly will take them into account.

The total offense level accurately reflects the nature and circumstances of the offense. With respect to the history and characteristics of the defendant: As I've noted,

Mr. Henderson has earned his Criminal Category VI fair and square two different ways: One by accumulating twice as many Criminal History Points as is required to reach a Criminal History Category of six.

"Secondly, as a result of the nature of his prior convictions."

I will say though that disgusting, to use

Mr. Henderson's words, Criminal History record does not seem to

reflect accurately the person that Mr. Henderson is today.

In making that comment, I rely not only on what Mr. Dratel said, but I rely on what Mr. Henderson has done since he has been incarcerated. As is set out in the sentencing materials, Mr. Henderson has tutored others in receiving their GED. He's worked two jobs. I did note that his evaluations at the MDC -- which I can't lay my fingers on right now -- but have him listed as outstanding in all of the categories that are noted.

I also take into account Mr. Henderson's letter and the letters of others acknowledging his wrongful conduct in the past, accepting responsibility for it, and recognizing the importance of family and friends. So I certainly take all of those factors into account in considering the characteristics of this defendant.

With respect to the paragraph two factors, certainly there is a need for an incarceratory sentence to reflect the

seriousness of the offense and to promote respect for the law.

My concern, however, is that the guideline is apparently, in my

view, greater than what is required to achieve this goal.

Paragraph B talks about public deterrence, and certainly an incarceratory sentence which required there.

As to paragraph C: The need to protect the public from further crimes of this defendant.

Based on Mr. Henderson's criminal history, one would think that an exceeding lengthy time of incarceration is required to protect the public from future crimes of Mr. Henderson.

However, in light of what he has done while incarcerated, his own letter and the letters of others, a guideline sentence appears to me to be greater than what is required to achieve this goal.

With respect to paragraph D: The need for educational or vocational training, I think those factors are of less import in this case than in others.

I've read the paragraph 3, 4 and 5 factors and have considered them.

With respect to paragraph 6, the need to avowed unwarranted sentencing disparities: As is apparent from the conversations that Mr. Dratel and I have had, I am aware of the sentences given to other similarly situated individuals in this case.

To the extent that there is a disparity perceived here, it is warranted, in my view, because of the rehabilitation Mr. Henderson has undertaken even since his incarceration.

Taking all of those factors into account counsel, it would normally be my view that a sentence of 51 months is appropriate to meet the sentencing factors. In light of the fact that Mr. Henderson has spent 34 months incarcerated now in the state on a crime that is part of the conspiracy of conviction here, that time should be subtracted under Section 5G.1.3. Accordingly, it is my intention to impose a sentence of 17 months from today on Mr. Henderson.

It is my intention to impose a period of ten years of supervised release.

It is my intention to impose a substance abuse program and alcohol after care program, and to impose the search provision as special conditions.

Mr. Dratel, what is your view of vocational counseling and/or training?

MR. DRATEL: Whatever is available, your Honor. It would be appreciated.

THE COURT: It is my intention to impose vocational consultation and training. It is not my intention to impose a fine on a finding that Mr. Henderson is not able to afford a fine at this point.

1 Is the government seeking forfeiture or restitution 2 here? 3 MR. TEHRANI: No, your Honor. 4 THE COURT: Thank you. 5 It is my intention to impose the \$100 special 6 assessment. 7 Counsel, is there any reason why should a sentence should not be imposed? 8 9 MR. DRATEL: No, your Honor. 10 MR. TEHRANI: No, your Honor. I just ask because I 11 want it to be crystal clear that you intend the sentence to be 12 concurrent with the state sentence. 13 THE COURT: Yes. Thank you. 14 Mr. Henderson. 15 THE DEFENDANT: Yes. THE COURT: You are sentenced, sir, to 17 months of 16 17 incarceration. The Court intends it to be concurrent with the 18 state sentence. That is 17 months from today. Following your 19 release, sir, you will spend ten years on supervised release. 20 The reason for that, sir, is to see if you put your money where 21 your mouth is. We will keep an eye on you, and if you do as 22 you say, then you benefit. If you don't, then we will have a 23 do-over here. Do you understand what I'm saying, sir? 24 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, ma'am.

THE COURT: During the period of supervised release,

25

you will comply with all of the standard and conditions of supervised release. Among them are that you not commit another federal, state or local crime; you not illegally possess a controlled substance, and you may not possess a firearm or other destructive device.

In addition to those and all of the other standard terms and conditions of supervised release, during that period you will participate in a program approved by the probation officer for substance abuse. That program will include testing to determine whether you've gone back to the use of drugs.

The Court authorizes the release of available drug treatment evaluations and reports to the substance abuse treatment provider as approved by the probation officer.

In addition, sir, during that period, you will participate in an alcohol after-care program, sir, as required by the probation officer. You might be required to pay some or all of the costs of both of those programs depending on your ability to pay and the availability of third-party payment.

In addition, sir, during that period, you will submit your person, residence, place of business, vehicle, electronic devices and any other premises under your control to a search on the ground that the probation officer has reasonable belief that contraband or evidence of a violation of the terms and conditions of your release can be found there.

Such a search plus be conducted at a reasonable time

and in a reasonable manner. Failure to submit to such a search might be grounds for revoking your supervised release.

It will be your obligation to inform other resident's of the premises or the electronic devices that they might be subject to a search under this condition.

Finally, sir, during the period of your supervised release, you will participate in vocational and employment training programs as approved by the probation officer.

As I mentioned, I do not impose a fine or any forfeiture but must impose and do impose the \$100 special assessment. That should be paid promptly.

It is my duty to inform you, sir, that unless you have waived it, you might have the right to appeal this sentence and might have the right to appeal in forma pauperis, which means as a poor person, with the waiver of certain fees and expenses.

Counsel, is there anything further?

MR. TEHRANI: Your Honor, government moves at this time to dismiss all open counts against Mr. Henderson.

THE COURT: So ordered, Mr. Dratel.

MR. DRATEL: Nothing further, your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. Henderson, no let's see if you do can do it. As I medication, you earned those criminal history points fair and square, but now you've got do what you tell me you're going to do.

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, ma'am.

THE COURT: You have a daughter to take care of. 1 2 I noted in the sentencing materials that you have been 3 writing to her even though she hasn't been able to come to visit you. Keep doing that. It's very important. 4 5 important for girls how their dads treat them. So you keep up 6 that good work. 7 I will tell you again: The reason you have ten years 8 of supervised release is to see if you can do what you say you 9 can do. You are welcome to come visit any time, but I don't 10 want you sitting next to Mr. Dratel there, and making a liar 11 out of him. 12 Do you understand? 13 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, ma'am. 14 THE COURT: Yes, sir. Good luck, sir. Counsel, thank 15 you for your assistance. Thank you, Mr. Marshal. 16 (Adjourned) 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25